arXiv:1108.6286v2 [math.FA] 14 Jun 2012

Representation of the inverse of a multiplier as a multiplier

Peter Balazs* and Diana T. Stoeva†
Acoustics Research Institute,
Wohllebengasse 12-14, Vienna A-1040, Austria

June 15, 2012

Abstract

Frame multipliers are interesting mathematical objects consisting of analysis, multiplication by a fixed sequence (called the symbol), and synthesis. Since they are important for applications, for example for the realization of time-varying filters, their inversion is of interest. For Riesz bases and semi-normalized symbols, it is known that the inverse of the multiplier can be found by using the biorthogonal sequences and the reciprocal symbol. In this paper we extend the class of multipliers where the inverse is represented by a multiplier. In particular, we show that for semi-normalized symbols any invertible frame multiplier can be represented as a frame multiplier with dual sequences. Furthermore, we give sufficient conditions, so that the inverse involves the reciprocal symbol and the canonical duals.

Keywords: multiplier, invertibility, frame, Riesz basis, Bessel sequence
MSC 2010: 42C15, 47A05

---

*peter.balazs@oeaw.ac.at
†std73std@yahoo.com

[1] This work was supported by the WWTF project MULAC ('Frame Multipliers: Theory and Application in Acoustics; #MA07-025).

1 Introduction, Notation, and Motivation

Gabor multipliers were investigated as mathematical objects [10]. As an extension, multipliers for general Bessel sequences were introduced by one of the authors [3]. Further, multipliers for general sequences were investigated in [14, 15, 16]. These are operators defined by

$$M_{(m_n),(\phi_n),(\psi_n)}h = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m_n \langle h, \psi_n \rangle \phi_n, \tag{1.1}$$

for given sequences (ϕ_n) and (ψ_n) with elements from a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, and a given complex scalar sequence (m_n) called the *symbol*.

Multipliers are interesting not only from theoretical point of view, but also for applications. They are applied for example in psychoacoustical modelling [5] and denoising [12]. Multipliers are a particular way to implement time-variant filters [13]. Therefore, for some applications it is important to find the inverse of a multiplier if it exists. The paper [15] is devoted to invertibility of multipliers, necessary conditions for invertibility, sufficient conditions, and representation for the inverse via Neumann series.

In the present paper our attention is on how to express the inverses of invertible multipliers as multipliers.

Motivation

By the spectral theorem it is known that any compact operator on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space can be represented as a multiplier with orthonormal sequences. If such an operator is invertible, the inverse can just be found by inverting the symbol and switching the role of the sequences. To find this representation for a given operator by the singular value decomposition, can be numerically inefficient. Now consider invertible operators which are known to be representable as multipliers not necessarily with orthonormal sequences. Does this help in finding the inverse in a more efficient way? In [3] it is proved that, if m is semi-normalized, then a Riesz multiplier $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ is automatically invertible and

$$M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}^{-1} = M_{1/m,\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $\widetilde{\Phi}$ and $\widetilde{\Psi}$ denote the canonical duals of Φ and Ψ. This therefore generalizes the representations of the inverses of compact operators using orthonormal sequences.

The result on Riesz multipliers has opened the following questions:

> [**Q1**] *Are there other invertible multipliers whose inverses can be written as multipliers? Can we represent them by inverting the symbols?*
>
> [**Q2**] *Are there other invertible frame multipliers* $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ *whose inverses can be written as* $M_{1/m,\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}}$ *using the canonical duals ?*

The paper is devoted to these two questions. Section 2 gives an affirmative answer of Question [$Q1$]. Among the invertible multipliers, we determine several classes of multipliers whose inverses can be written as multipliers. In Section 3 we give an affirmative answer of Question [$Q2$]. We determine frame multipliers $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ (not necessarily being Riesz multipliers) which are invertible and their inverses can be written as $M_{1/m,\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}}$. We note that not all the invertible frame multipliers have such a representation for the inverse.

Notation and definitions

Throughout the paper, $\mathcal{H}$ denotes a Hilbert space, $\Phi = (\phi_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $\Psi = (\psi_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are sequences with elements from $\mathcal{H}$. The sequence $(e_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ denotes an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$ and $(\delta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ denotes the canonical basis of ℓ^2. When the index set is omitted, $\mathbb{N}$ should be understood as the index set. The letter m is used to denote a complex valued scalar sequence (m_n). Furthermore, $\overline{m} = (\overline{m}_n)$ and $1/m = (1/m_n)$. The sequence m is called *semi-normalized* if $0 < \inf_n |m_n| \leq \sup_n |m_n| < \infty$. For $m \in \ell^\infty$, we will use the operator $\mathcal{M}_m : \ell^2 \to \ell^2$ given by $\mathcal{M}_m(c_n) = (m_n c_n)$, which is bounded with $\|\mathcal{M}_m\| = \|m\|_{\ell^\infty}$. A linear mapping is called an *operator*. An operator $M : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is called *invertible* if it a bounded bijection from $\mathcal{H}$ onto $\mathcal{H}$.

Recall that Φ is called a *frame for* $\mathcal{H}$ *with bounds* A_Φ, B_Φ if $0 < A_\Phi \leq B_\Phi < \infty$ and $A_\Phi \|h\|^2 \leq \sum |\langle h, \phi_n\rangle|^2 \leq B_\Phi \|h\|^2$ for every $h \in \mathcal{H}$. For definitions of Bessel sequence, Riesz basis, analysis, synthesis and frame operator, the canonical and other duals of a frame - we refer to [8]. For a given frame Φ for $\mathcal{H}$, the analysis operator is denoted by U_Φ, the synthesis operator - by T_Φ, the frame operator - by S_Φ, and the canonical dual - by $\widetilde{\Phi}$.

For given m, Φ, and Ψ, the operator $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ given by Equation 1.1 is called a *multiplier*. The operator $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ is called *unconditionally convergent* if the series in (1.1) converges unconditionally for every $h \in \mathcal{H}$. When Φ and

Ψ are Bessel sequences, frames, Riesz bases for $\mathcal{H}$, then $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ will be called a *Bessel multiplier, frame multiplier, Riesz multiplier,* respectively. When $m \in \ell^\infty$, then a Bessel multiplier is well defined operator from $\mathcal{H}$ into $\mathcal{H}$ [3].

Recall the modulation operator $E_\omega : L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right) \to L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$ and the translation operator $T_\tau : L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right) \to L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$ given by

$$(E_\omega f)(x) = e^{2\pi i \omega x} f(x),\ (T_\tau f)(x) = f(x-\tau).$$

The symbol $\Lambda = \{(\omega, \tau)\}$ denotes a lattice in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$. For $\lambda = (\omega, \tau) \in \Lambda$, the operator $E_\omega T_\tau$ is denoted by $\pi(\lambda)$. For a given $g \in L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$, a sequence of the form $(g_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda} = (\pi(\lambda)g)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is called a *Gabor system.* When a Gabor system is a frame, it is called a *Gabor frame.* Recall that the canonical dual of a Gabor frame $(g_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is the Gabor frame $(\widetilde{g}_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda} = (\pi(\lambda)\widetilde{g})_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$, where $\widetilde{g} = S^{-1}_{(\pi(\lambda)g)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}} g$. When Φ and Ψ are Gabor systems (resp. Gabor frames), then $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ is called a *Gabor multiplier* (resp. *Gabor frame multiplier*).

2 Inversion of Multipliers by Inverted Symbol [Q1] and Dual Frames

Here we give an affirmative answer of Question $[Q1]$. In the next propositions we determine three classes of invertible multipliers whose inverses can be written as multipliers:

- the invertible frame multipliers with semi-normalized weights (for example of such a multiplier see Ex. 3.1); [1]
- the invertible multipliers $M_{m,\Phi,\Phi}$ which are unconditionally convergent (for example of such a multiplier see Ex. 3.1);
- the invertible multipliers $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ which are unconditionally convergent and Φ is minimal (for example of such a multiplier consider $M_{(n),(\frac{1}{n}e_n),(e_n)}$ whose inverse can be written as $M_{(1),(e_n),(e_n)}$);
- the invertible multipliers $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ which are unconditionally convergent and $\inf_n |m_n| \cdot \|\phi_n\| \cdot \|\psi_n\| > 0$.

---

[1] This is particularly interesting, because arbitrary frames Ψ and Φ with arbitrary duals Ψ^d and Φ^d, respectively, do not necessarily satisfy $T_\Phi U_\Psi T_{\Psi^d} U_{\Phi^d} =$ Identity.

Theorem 2.1. *Let* Φ *and* Ψ *be frames for* $\mathcal{H}$, *and let* m *be semi-normalized. Assume that* $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ *is invertible. Then there exist a dual frame* $\Phi^\dagger$ *of* Φ *and a dual frame* $\Psi^\dagger$ *of* Ψ, *so that for any dual frames* Φ^d *and* Ψ^d *of* Φ *and* Ψ, *respectively, we have*

$$M^{-1}_{m,\Phi,\Psi} = M_{1/m,\Psi^\dagger,\Phi^d} = M_{1/m,\Psi^d,\Phi^\dagger}. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof: Denote $M := M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$. First observe that the sequence $(M^{-1}(m_n\phi_n))$ is a dual frame of Ψ. Denote it by $\Psi^\dagger$. Therefore, $M^{-1}T_\Phi\delta_n = T_{\Psi^\dagger}\mathcal{M}_{1/m}\delta_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now the boundedness of the operators imply that $M^{-1}T_\Phi = T_{\Psi^\dagger}\mathcal{M}_{1/m}$ on ℓ^2. By using any dual frame Φ^d of Φ we get $M^{-1} = T_{\Psi^\dagger}\mathcal{M}_{1/m}U_{\Phi^d} = M_{1/m,\Psi^\dagger,\Phi^d}$ on $\mathcal{H}$.

In a similar way as above, it follows that the sequence $((M^{-1})^*(\overline{m_n}\psi_n))$ is a dual frame of Φ (denoted by $\Phi^\dagger$) and $(M^{-1})^* = T_{\Phi^\dagger}\mathcal{M}_{1/\overline{m}}U_{\Psi^d}$ which implies that $M^{-1} = T_{\Psi^d}\mathcal{M}_{1/m}U_{\Phi^\dagger} = M_{1/m,\Psi^d,\Phi^\dagger}$. $\Box$

In particular, we can choose for Φ^d and Ψ^d the canonical duals. A similar argument in a weak sense could be used for an analog result for continuous frame multipliers [4].

Note that (2.1) is *not* a constructive approach leading to an implementation for the inversion of M. For the dual frame $\Psi^\dagger$ (resp. $\Phi^\dagger$) we already had to apply M^{-1}. For more constructive approaches to the inversion of multipliers see [15].

Proposition 2.2. *Let* $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ *be invertible and unconditionally convergent.*

(i) *If* Φ *is minimal, then* $M^{-1}_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ *can be written as a multiplier.*

(ii) *If* $\Phi = \Psi$, *then* $M^{-1}_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ *can be written as a multiplier.*

(iii) *If* $\inf_n |m_n| \cdot \|\phi_n\| \cdot \|\psi_n\| > 0$, *then* $M^{-1}_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ *can be written as a multiplier.*

Proof: For all these conditions, by [16], there exist sequences (c_n) and (d_n) so that $m = (c_n\overline{d_n})$ and the sequences $(c_n\phi_n)$ and $(d_n\psi_n)$ are frames for $\mathcal{H}$. Thus, $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi} = M_{(1),(c_n\phi_n),(d_n\psi_n)}$ and one can apply Theorem 2.1. $\Box$

For the most useful frames in applications, the following holds:

Corollary 2.3. *Let* Φ *and* Ψ *be Gabor systems and* m *be semi-normalized. If* $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ *is invertible and unconditionally convergent, then* $M^{-1}_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ *can be written as a multiplier.*

This corollary is true for any 'coherent system' [1], where the frame elements are created by applying the unitary representation of a group on one element (or even on fintely many elements). In particular it is also true for wavelet systems.

Remark 2.1. In [16] the following Question is posed: *For invertible, unconditionally convergent multiplier* $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$*, do* (c_n) *and* (d_n) *exist so that* $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi} = M_{(1),(c_n\phi_n),(d_n\psi_n)}$ *and the sequences* $(c_n\phi_n)$*,* $(d_n\psi_n)$ *are frames for* $\mathcal{H}$*?* If a conjecture in [16] is true, the answer to this question is always 'Yes', and so the inverse of every such multiplier can be written as a multiplier.

3 Inversion of Multipliers Using the Canonical Duals [Q2]

The following is an example where Question [$Q2$] is affirmatively answered.

Example 3.1. Let $\Phi = (e_1, e_1, e_2, e_2, e_3, e_3, \ldots)$. Then $M_{(1),\widetilde{\Phi},\widetilde{\Phi}} = \frac{1}{2}\,\text{Identity} = M^{-1}_{(1),\Phi,\Phi}$.

Example 3.2 shows a case when $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ is invertible but the inverse is not equal to $M_{1/m,\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}}$.

Example 3.2. Let $\Phi = (e_1, e_1, e_1, e_2, e_2, e_2, e_3, e_3, e_3, \ldots)$ and $\Psi = (e_1, e_1, -e_1, e_2, e_2, -e_2, e_3, e_3, -e_3, \ldots)$. Then $M_{(1),\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}} = \frac{1}{9}\,\text{Identity} \neq M^{-1}_{(1),\Phi,\Psi}$.

The next theorem determines a class of multipliers which are invertible and whose inverses can be written as in (1.2). While Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 assume that the multiplier is invertible, in Theorem 3.1 we investigate the invertibility of multipliers - we give sufficient conditions for invertibility and sufficient conditions for non-invertibility of multipliers. For the rest of the section the letter c means a non-zero constant.

Theorem 3.1. *Let* Φ *and* Ψ *be frames for* $\mathcal{H}$ *and* $(m_n) = (c)$*. Then the following assertions hold.*

(i) *If* $\mathcal{R}(U_\Phi) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(U_\Psi)$*, then* $M_{(1/c),\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}}$ *is a bounded right inverse of* $M_{(c),\Phi,\Psi}$*.*

(ii) *If* $\mathcal{R}(U_\Psi) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(U_\Phi)$*, then* $M_{(1/c),\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}}$ *is a bounded left inverse of* $M_{(c),\Phi,\Psi}$*.*

(iii) *If* $\mathcal{R}(U_\Phi) = \mathcal{R}(U_\Psi)$, *then* $M_{(c),\Phi,\Psi}$ *is invertible and* $M^{-1}_{(c),\Phi,\Psi} = M_{(\frac{1}{c}),\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}}$.

(iv) *If* $\mathcal{R}(U_\Phi) \subsetneq \mathcal{R}(U_\Psi)$, *then* $M_{(c),\Phi,\Psi}$ *is not invertible.*

(v) *If* $\mathcal{R}(U_\Psi) \subsetneq \mathcal{R}(U_\Phi)$, *then* $M_{(c),\Phi,\Psi}$ *is not invertible.*

Proof: (i) Assume that $\mathcal{R}(U_\Phi) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(U_\Psi)$. For every $h \in \mathcal{H}$, the element $U_\Phi S_\Phi^{-1} h$ can be written as $U_\Psi g^h$ for some $g^h \in \mathcal{H}$ and

$$M_{(c),\Phi,\Psi} M_{(1/c),\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}} h = T_\Phi U_\Psi S_\Psi^{-1} T_\Psi U_\Phi S_\Phi^{-1} h = T_\Phi U_\Psi g^h = h.$$

(ii) can be proved in a similar way as (i).

(iii) follows from (i) and (ii).

(iv) Assume that $\mathcal{R}(U_\Phi) \subset \mathcal{R}(U_\Psi)$ with $\mathcal{R}(U_\Phi) \neq \mathcal{R}(U_\Psi)$. By (i), the operator $M_{(1/c),\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}}$ is a bounded right inverse of $M_{(c),\Phi,\Psi}$. We will prove that $M_{(1/c),\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}}$ is not a left inverse of $M_{(c),\Phi,\Psi}$, which will imply that $M_{(c),\Phi,\Psi}$ can not be invertible. Consider an arbitrary element $g \in \mathcal{R}(U_\Psi) \setminus \mathcal{R}(U_\Phi)$ and write $g = U_\Psi h$ for some $h \in \mathcal{H}$. Since $\ell^2 = \mathcal{R}(U_\Phi) \oplus \ker(T_\Phi)$, we can also write $g = U_\Phi f + d$ for some $f \in \mathcal{H}$ and some $d \in \ker(T_\Phi)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} M_{(1/c),\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}} M_{(c),\Phi,\Psi} h &= S_\Psi^{-1} T_\Psi U_\Phi S_\Phi^{-1} T_\Phi U_\Psi h = S_\Psi^{-1} T_\Psi U_\Phi S_\Phi^{-1} T_\Phi (U_\Phi f + d) \\ &= S_\Psi^{-1} T_\Psi (U_\Psi h - d) = h - S_\Psi^{-1} T_\Psi d. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $S_\Psi^{-1} T_\Psi d \neq 0$, which implies that $M_{(1/c),\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}}$ is not a left inverse of $M_{(c),\Phi,\Psi}$.

(v) By (i), $M_{(1/c),\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}}$ is a bounded left inverse of $M_{(c),\Phi,\Psi}$. In a similar way as in (iv), one can prove that $M_{(1/c),\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}}$ is not a right inverse of $M_{(c),\Phi,\Psi}$, which implies that $M_{(c),\Phi,\Psi}$ can not be invertible. □

Remark 3.1. Let Φ and Ψ be frames for $\mathcal{H}$. The condition $\mathcal{R}(U_\Phi) = \mathcal{R}(U_\Psi)$ corresponds to Φ and Ψ being equivalent frames [7, Corollary 4.5], i.e., to the existence of a bounded and invertible operator $G : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$, such that $G\phi_k = \psi_k$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$. The condition $\mathcal{R}(U_\Phi) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(U_\Psi)$ is identical to Ψ being partial equivalent to Φ [2], i.e. to the existence of a bounded operator $Q : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$, such that $\phi_k = Q\psi_k$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Note that if none of $\mathcal{R}(U_\Phi)$ and $\mathcal{R}(U_\Psi)$ is a subset of the other one, then both invertibility and non-invertibility of $M_{m,\Phi,\Psi}$ are possible, see Examples 3.3 and 3.4.

Example 3.3. (invertible multiplier) Consider the frames $\Phi = (e_1, e_1, e_2, e_2, e_3, e_3, e_4, e_4, \ldots)$ and $\Psi = (\frac{1}{2}e_1, \frac{1}{2}e_1, \frac{1}{2}e_2, \frac{1}{2}e_2, \frac{1}{3}e_3, \frac{2}{3}e_3, \frac{1}{4}e_4, \frac{3}{4}e_4, \ldots)$. Then $M_{(1),\Phi,\Psi}$ is the Identity operator on $\mathcal{H}$.

Example 3.4. (non-invertible multiplier) Consider the frames $\Phi = (e_1, e_1, e_2, e_2, e_3, e_3, e_4, e_4, \ldots)$ and $\Psi = (e_1, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, \ldots)$. Then $M_{(1),\Phi,\Psi}$ is not invertible.

Corollary 3.2. *If Φ and Ψ are equivalent frames, then $M^{-1}_{(c),\Phi,\Psi}$ is invertible and $M^{-1}_{(c),\Phi,\Psi} = M_{(\frac{1}{c}),\widetilde{\Psi},\widetilde{\Phi}}$.*

3.1 Gabor frames

By Corollary 2.3, an invertible Gabor frame multiplier with semi-normalized symbol has inverse which can be written as a multiplier. Here we are interested in cases when the inverse can be written as a Gabor multiplier.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and let $(\pi(\lambda)g)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ be a Gabor frame for $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let $V : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a bounded bijective operator. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

1. *For every $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $V\pi(\lambda)g = \pi(\lambda)Vg$.*
2. *For every $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and every $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $V\pi(\lambda)f = \pi(\lambda)Vf$ (i.e., V commutes with $\pi(\lambda)$ for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$).*
3. *V can be written as a Gabor frame multiplier with symbol (1).*
4. *V^{-1} can be written as a Gabor frame multiplier with symbol (1).*

Proof. (3) $\Longrightarrow$ (2) Let V be the Gabor frame multiplier $M_{(1),(\pi(\lambda)v)_{\lambda\in\Lambda},(\pi(\lambda)u)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}}$. For every $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and every $\lambda \in \Lambda$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V\pi(\lambda)f &= \sum_{\lambda'\in\Lambda} \langle \pi(\lambda)f, \pi(\lambda')u\rangle\, \pi(\lambda')v \\
&= \sum_{\lambda'\in\Lambda} \left\langle f, e^{2\pi i\tau(\omega'-\omega)}\pi(\lambda'-\lambda)u\right\rangle \pi(\lambda')v \\
&= \sum_{\lambda''\in\Lambda} \left\langle f, e^{2\pi i\tau\omega''}\pi(\lambda'')u\right\rangle \pi(\lambda''+\lambda)v \\
&= \sum_{\lambda''\in\Lambda} \left\langle f, e^{2\pi i\tau\omega''}\pi(\lambda'')u\right\rangle e^{2\pi i\tau\omega''}\pi(\lambda)\pi(\lambda'')v = \pi(\lambda)Vf.
\end{aligned}$$

The above calculations are similar to the proof that the frame operator commutes with $\pi(\lambda)$ (see, e.g., [8, Sec. 9.3]).

(1) $\Longrightarrow$ (3) For every $f \in L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$,

$$Vf = V\left(\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \langle f, \widetilde{g}_\lambda\rangle\, g_\lambda\right) = \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \langle f, \widetilde{g}_\lambda\rangle\, \pi(\lambda)Vg, \tag{3.1}$$

which means that V can be written as a Gabor frame multiplier with symbol (1).

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (1) is obvious.

(1) $\Longrightarrow$ (4) For $\lambda \in \Lambda$, denote $h_\lambda = \pi(\lambda)Vg$. By what is already proved, V is the multiplier $M_{(1),(h_\lambda),(\widetilde{g}_\lambda)}$. Since (h_λ) and $(\widetilde{g}_\lambda)$ are equivalent frames, Corollary 3.2 implies that $M^{-1}_{(1),(h_\lambda),(\widetilde{g}_\lambda)} = M_{(1),(g_\lambda),(\widetilde{h}_\lambda)}$.

(4) $\Longrightarrow$ (2) Having in mind the implication (3) $\Longrightarrow$ (2) applied to V^{-1}, it follows that V^{-1} commutes with $\pi(\lambda)$, $\forall\lambda \in \Lambda$. Therefore, V also commutes with $\pi(\lambda)$, $\forall\lambda \in \Lambda$. □

As a consequence, the inverse of every invertible Gabor frame multiplier with constant symbol can be written as a Gabor frame multiplier.

Corollary 3.4. *Let* $V : L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right) \to L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$ *be an invertible Gabor frame multiplier* $M_{(1),(\pi(\lambda)v)_{\lambda\in\Lambda},(\pi(\lambda)u)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}}$. *Let* $(g_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda} = (\pi(\lambda)g)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ *be any Gabor frame for* $L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^d\right)$. *Then* V^{-1} *can be written as the Gabor frame multiplier* $M_{(1),(g_\lambda),(\widetilde{h}_\lambda)}$, *where* $h_\lambda = \pi(\lambda)Vg$, $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

Remark 3.2. Concerning Theorem 3.3, note that if the operator V is only assumed to be

- bounded, then (3) $\Rightarrow$ (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (1);
- bounded and surjective, then (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3).

Remark 3.3. This result gives a nice representation and criterion for TF-Lattice invariant operators [11].

Acknowledgments The authors are thankful to H. Feichtinger for his valuable comments. The second author is grateful for the hospitality of the Acoustics Research Institute and the support from the MULAC-project.

References

[1] S. T. Ali, J.-P. Antoine and J.-P. Gazeau. *Coherent States, Wavelets and Their Generalization*, Springer New York, 2000.

[2] R. M. Balan. Equivalence relations and distances between Hilbert frames. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 127(8):2353–2366, 1999.

[3] P. Balazs. Basic definition and properties of Bessel multipliers. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 325(1):571–585, 2007.

[4] P. Balazs, D. Bayer, and A. Rahimi. Multipliers for continuous frames in Hilbert spaces Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical, in press, 2012.

[5] P. Balazs, B. Laback, G. Eckel, and W. A. Deutsch. Time-frequency sparsity by removing perceptually irrelevant components using a simple model of simultaneous masking. *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech and Language Processing*, 18(1):34–49, 2010.

[6] J. Benedetto, and G. Pfander. Frame expansions for Gabor multipliers *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 20:26–40, 2006.

[7] P. Casazza. The art of frame theory. *Taiwanese J. Math.*, 4(2):129–202, 2000.

[8] O. Christensen. *An Introduction To Frames And Riesz Bases.* Birkhäuser, 2003.

[9] S. Dahlke, M. Fornasier and T. Raasch. Adaptive Frame Methods for Elliptic Operator Equations. *Adv. Comput. Math.* 27(1):27–63, 2005.

[10] H. G. Feichtinger and K. Nowak. *A first survey of Gabor multipliers*, chapter 5 in "Gabor Analysis and Algorithms", Edited by H. G. Feichtinger an T. Strohmer, Birkhäuser Boston, 99–128, 2003.

[11] H. G. Feichtinger and W. Kozek. *Quantization of TF lattice-invariant operators on elementary LCA groups*, chapter 7 in 'Gabor Analysis and Algorithms - Theory and Applications' (Eds. H. G. Feichtinger, T. Strohmer), pages 233-266, 1998.

[12] P. Majdak, P. Balazs, W. Kreuzer, and M. Dörfler. A time-frequency method for increasing the signal-to-noise ratio in system identification with exponential sweeps. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2011, Prag*, 2011.

[13] G. Matz, and F. Hlawatsch. *Linear Time-Frequency Filters: On-line Algorithms and Applications*, in Application in Time-Frequency Signal Processing, eds. A. Papandreou-Suppappola, Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press, pages 205–271, 2002.

[14] D. T. Stoeva and P. Balazs. Detailed characterization of unconditional convergence and invertibility of multipliers. Submitted. (arXiv:1007.0673, 2010).

[15] D. T. Stoeva and P. Balazs. Invertibility of multipliers. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 33:292–299, 2012.

[16] D. T. Stoeva and P. Balazs. Canonical forms of unconditionally convergent multipliers. Submitted. (arXiv:1108.5629, 2011).